

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 Plaintiff, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 vs. )                                 No. CR-15-245-C  
                                  )  
                                  )  
SHARON DIANE LITTLE, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 Defendant. )

**ORDER**

Defendant seeks early termination of her term of supervised release. Defendant pleaded guilty to a number of counts arising from her participation in a steroid distribution enterprise. The Court has heard from the United States Probation Office and Plaintiff, both of whom who oppose Defendant's request for early termination of supervised release.

18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1) governs Defendant's request. In pertinent part that statute states:

The Court may, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)–

(1) terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice . . . .

Defendant has offered no argument demonstrating early termination is in the interest of justice. Rather, she offers only the unsupported statement that early termination would assist her in obtaining different employment. To be sure, Defendant has made significant

strides in rebuilding her life since her release and the Court commends her efforts. It is, of course, always encouraging when a person has made a positive turn in her life. Nevertheless, after considering the above factors, the Court finds that early termination is not warranted at this time. While Defendant has been compliant with the terms of her release, the relevant time period is simply too brief. Rather, the Court finds that when considering the underlying offense, a longer period of post-incarceration monitoring is necessary.

For the reasons set forth herein, Defendant's Motion for Order to Terminate Supervised Release Early (Dkt. No. 157) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 29th day of October, 2020.



ROBIN J. CAUTHRON  
United States District Judge